

Amendments To the Drawings:

The attached sheets of drawings include a change to Fig. 11b, appearing in three sheets, Fig. 11b(i), Fig. 11b(ii) and Fig. 11b(iii) and with the change appearing only in the latter. These sheets replace the original sheets. Fig. 11b, previously omitted reference number 700 referencing the switch 700, which has now been added to Fig. 11b, namely sheet Fig. 11b(iii).

Attachment: Replacement Sheets
Annotated Sheets Showing Change

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicants thank the Examiner Mr. Chun-Kuan (Mike) Lee and the SPE, Mr. Fritz Fleming, for their time in conducting an Examiner's interview, this is truly appreciated. Receipt of the Interview Summary, dated May 31, 2006, is acknowledged and the comments/remarks stated on the Continuation Page of the same are believed to be accurate with one exception, as noted below.

A terminal disclaimer, under 37 CFR 1.321, and appropriate fees are being submitted herewith and believed to overcome the nonstatutory double patenting rejection of claims 1-16 and 19-32. Furthermore, a number of co-inventors are being added and documents are being submitted to effectuate the same.

The specification is amended, as recited hereinabove, to correct typographical and grammatical errors, no new subject matter has been added. Claims 1-7, 9 - 26 and 28 - 32 remain in the subject application. Claims 8 and 27 have been canceled without prejudice, Applicant reserves the right to reinstate the same in the future. Claim 33 is added. Claims 1, 16, 17 and 20 have been amended, as recited hereinabove.

Claims 1-16 and 19-32 have been provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-30 of copending Application No. 10/775521 in view of "SATA vs. PATA: the reality of Serial and Parallel ATA - Serial ATA". A terminal disclaimer is being submitted herewith and is believed to overcome this rejection.

Claims 1, 6-7, 9-14, 18-19, 23-24, 26-32, 36-37 and 39-43 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Grieff et al. (US Patent 6,961,813) (hereinafter "Grieff") in view of "SATA vs. PATA: The Reality of Serial and Parallel ATA - Serial ATA". It is believed that claims 1, 13 and 31, as amended hereinabove, and all claims depending therefrom are patentable over Grieff. As discussed during the Interview, the "concurrency", has been added to the language of the claims and defined on page 44, lines 24-26 of the subject specification.

It is believed that, in Grieff, for a number of reasons, which, for the sake of brevity, are not enumerated here, at any given time, only one of the host ports (130 or 132) can send commands to the drive via the dual port adaptor. More specifically, while a host that has won arbitration is permitted to send a command to the dual port adaptor, the other host

is prevented from sending commands to the dual port adaptor until the occurrence of a particular event -- assignment, by the arbiter module 112, of the highest priority to the host that is prevented from sending commands upon completion of execution of the command in progress [See Grieff: Col. 5, Ins. 49-64 and col. 7, Ins. 2-6]. Accordingly, it is believed that the dual port adaptor of Grieff receives commands sequentially.

In contrast thereto, in an embodiment of the present invention, as shown, for example, in Fig. 6 of the subject application, the host ports (310, and 320) are layer 4 SATA ports which each include a task file for receiving commands from a host regardless of the host winning arbitration. Thus, the hosts are not required to win arbitration prior to sending a command to the switch, as required in Grieff, rather, the two hosts, through their respective host ports can send commands to the switch concurrently, as recited in the amended claimed invention. Thus, it is believed that claims 1 and 20 are patentable over Grieff and therefore, all claims depending therefrom are necessarily patentable over Grieff.

As a separate basis of patentability, the combination of Grieff and "SATA vs. PATA: The Reality of Serial and Parallel ATA – Serial ATA", as the basis of rejection, is disagreed therewith since neither of these references suggests or hints at the teachings of the other.

Claims 2-4, 20-22 and 33-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Grieff and "SATA vs. PATA: The Reality of Serial and Parallel ATA – Serial ATA" (herein referred to as the "SATA reference"), and further in view of Ng, U.S. Patent No. 6,388,590 (herein referred to as the "Ng" patent). It is believed that the claimed invention is patentable over these references for, inter alia, the foregoing reasons and for depending from patentable claims.

As a separate basis of patentability, the combination of Grieff and the SATA reference, as the basis of rejection, is disagreed therewith since neither of these references suggests or hints at the teachings of the other.

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Grieff, the SATA reference and the Ng patent and further in view of Boucher et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,434,620 (hereinafter referred to as the "Boucher" patent). It is believed that claim 5 is patentable over these references for, inter alia, the foregoing reasons and for depending from a patentable claim. As a separate basis of patentability, the combination

of the foregoing references, as the basis of rejection, is disagreed therewith since none of these references suggests or hints at the teachings of the others.

Claims 8, 25 and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Grieff, the SATA reference and further in view of Talati, U.S. Patent No. 6,763,402 (hereinafter referred to as the "Talati" patent). It is believed that claims 8, 25 and 38 are patentable over these references for, inter alia, the foregoing reasons and for depending from a patentable claim. As a separate basis of patentability, the combination of the foregoing references, as the basis of rejection, is disagreed therewith since none of these references suggests or hints at the teachings of the others.

Claims 15-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Grieff, the SATA reference and further in view of the "Serial ATA Specification"). It is believed that claims 15-16 are patentable over these references for, inter alia, the foregoing reasons and for depending from a patentable claim. As a separate basis of patentability, the combination of the foregoing references, as the basis of rejection, is disagreed therewith since none of these references suggests or hints at the teachings of the others.


Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Grieff, the SATA reference and the Ng patent and further in view of Boucher. It is believed that claim 17 is patentable over these references for, inter alia, the foregoing reasons and for depending from a patentable claim. As a separate basis of patentability, the combination of the foregoing references, as the basis of rejection, is disagreed therewith since none of these references suggests or hints at the teachings of the others.

Reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-43 is hereby respectfully requested. Applicants submit that the subject application is now in condition for allowance and an early notice thereof is respectfully requested. Should any further amendment be required prior to passing the application to issue, the Examiner is respectfully invited to contact the undersigned by telephone at the number set out below.

Application No. 10/775,521
Amendment dated July 5, 2006
Reply to Non-Final Office Action of April 5, 2006


Respectfully submitted,
LAW OFFICES OF IMAM

Dated: July 5, 2006
LAW OFFICES OF IMAM
111 North Market Street, Suite 1010
San Jose, CA 95113
Tel: 408-271-8752


By 
Maryam Imam
Reg. No. 38,190

Fax: 408-271-8886

I hereby certify that this correspondence with all attachments is being deposited with the U.S. Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop No Fee Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Arlington VA 22313-1450 on July 5, 2006 by Erika Villafana.



Attachments



37/43




FIG. 11b(ii)

38/43




FIG. 11b(iii)